

The Classical Weekly

MAR 16 1931

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOLUME XXIV, No. 18

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1931

WHOLE No. 655

*True to the mark
in content and
presentation*



*Pleasant to look at
and profitable
to use*

THE MACMILLAN CLASSICAL SERIES

**Books which provide, in fine form, the finest
of materials for to-day's High
School courses in Latin**

A unified series

*General Editor, B. L. ULLMAN
Professor of Latin, University of Chicago*

ELEMENTARY LATIN—B. L. ULLMAN and N. E. HENRY

Includes a study of the subjunctive.

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN—B. L. ULLMAN and N. E. HENRY

For classes which postpone a study of the subjunctive to the second year.

SECOND LATIN BOOK—B. L. ULLMAN and N. E. HENRY. Revised

THIRD LATIN BOOK—B. L. ULLMAN, N. E. HENRY, and D. S. WHITE

PROGRESS TESTS IN LATIN—B. L. ULLMAN and A. W. SMALLEY

EASY LATIN PLAYS—LILLIAN B. LAWLER

Recognized everywhere as standard

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

To accompany the successful Gray and
Jenkins Latin for Today, First-Year Course

BACON

DIAGNOSTIC TESTS

IN LATIN

These tests cover nine different tests in all, including true and false, multiple choice, and completion. Based as they are on a specific textbook, the Gray and Jenkins First-Year Course, their advantages are strikingly apparent. Can you afford to overlook them?

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston
Atlanta

New York
Dallas

Chicago
Columbus

London
San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 18

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1931

WHOLE NUMBER 655

THE TREATMENT OF CATILINE IN THE LATIN LITERATURE OF THE EARLY EMPIRE¹

The picture of Catiline which comes almost automatically to the minds of modern readers is that of the fire-breathing, swash-buckling desperado whom Cicero presents to us in the Orations against Catiline. Such, indeed, has, apparently, been the usual experience from the time when men began to read those orations. With the exception of one clause, *Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres*, probably no tag from Latin literature is so familiar as *Quo usque tandem*...? We may infer from Apuleius² that it was already a household word in his day. Of course we need not assume that this picture is an entirely truthful portrayal of Catiline.

A really definitive biography of Catiline remains to be written. A judicial study of his career would add much to our knowledge of an important period of Roman history. Neither an *ex parte* presentation, either pro-Catiline or anti-Catiline, nor a purely objective collection of facts in the manner of Pauly-Wissowa will quite serve the purpose. In no study of Catiline known to me can the material I am presenting in this paper be found³. I have myself at times tried to be impersonal in dealing with Catiline, and can testify to the difficulty of remembering that even Cicero sometimes saw good in him, or at least pretended to do so⁴.

I mean no disrespect to the scholars who have dealt with the Catilinarian conspiracy when I ask for a new biography of Catiline, nor do I take this opportunity to announce that I shall attempt one, though I might easily occupy myself with less profitable tasks. Nor do I in this paper inquire into the possible merits of Catiline's statesmanship. My present problem is merely to collect and, if possible, to interpret the allusions to Catiline in the Latin literature of the early Empire, in the hope of ascertaining the Roman conception of him at that time and of showing to what degree our attitude toward him is inherited and traditional.

Few things in the history of the early Empire are more mysterious than the treatment of the great figures of the last years of the Republic. The official deification of Caesar and the unofficial consecration of Cato

are intelligible. But the systematic semiofficial depreciation of Caesar's acts is not intelligible. Augustus's famous tribute to Cicero set the seal of official approval on the orator, and Livy's Pompeian tendencies brought him no loss of caste. Perhaps men were so willing as they will be seen to be to condemn Catiline partly because he and Caesar had once been associated. Other reasons, however, will be added as we proceed.

A convenient starting-point for our inquiry is afforded by the Aeneid, which contains at least two allusions to Catiline, while there may be others still unrecognized. In the description of the Shield of Aeneas we read (8.668-670):

et te, Catilina, minaci
pendentem scopulo Furiarumque ora trementem
secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem.

Here we find Catiline in a condition that must have gladdened the eyes of Cicero, if we can imagine him among the *secreti pii* over whom Cato rules. Servius, in his note on 668, even implies that the words *et te*... *scopulo* were inserted in *Ciceronis gratiam*. Certainly no admirer of Cicero could fail to be pleased by Vergil's treatment of Catiline at this point. But there is another though less definite reference to Catiline in the Aeneid (5.121). Here Sergestus, the ancestor of the Sergii, is one of the captains in the boat-race. Could any Roman reader, especially if he belonged to the older generation, think of Sergestus and of the Sergii without thinking also of Catiline? Were there no Roman families other than the Sergii, the Memmii, the Cluentii (these three are expressly named by Vergil), and the Geganii (added by Servius, in his note on 5.117, to make the list complete) that would have appreciated a Trojan crest and that numbered among their members personages equally important and less notorious? Professor R. S. Conway⁵ thinks of the passage in Book 8 as a "dark background behind a scene of thanksgiving...", but what is he to do with the verse in Book 5? Is this merely another of the Vergilian inconsistencies? Does it throw any light on the order of composition of the books of the Aeneid? I make no attempt at present to reply, but leave you confronted with an apparent paradox: in one passage Catiline is punished in Tartarus, in another passage Catiline's ancestor, Sergestus, occupies a position of apparent distinction. It may be added that the occasional other mentions of Sergestus's name are all respectful in tone (see especially 1.510; 4.288; 12.561, and references in the account of the boat-race). I may remind you, too, that the solidarity of the Roman family, even in the time of Vergil, was so great that Sergestus and Catiline were associated by the poet quite as certainly as Augustus and Atys, and only a

¹This paper was read at the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, May 16-17, 1930.

²Metamorphoses 3.27; 6.26.

³I acknowledge gratefully the assistance of Miss Winifred J. Beal, a graduate student in the Department of Latin, University of Pittsburgh, in the collection of references. I make no effort at this time to quote all allusions to Catiline, though I hope I have omitted none in the period chosen that is really significant.

⁴*Me ipsum, me, inquam, quondam paene ille* (= Catilina) *decepit* is Cicero's proclamation in Pro Caelio 14. The whole passage is worth examining. I regretfully, but deliberately, pass it by, as well as the questions suggested by the first and the second of the extant letters to Atticus. (For Cicero, Caelius, and Catiline see the remarks by Dr. M. M. Odgers, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23, 161 (April 7, 1930). C. K.).

⁵In Poetry and Government: A Study of the Power of Vergil, 9 (London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1928. Pp. 24).

little less positively than Augustus and Aeneas⁶. But, after all, our interest for the moment is less in what Vergil meant by his attempt to provide the Sergii with Trojan lineage than in his attitude toward Catiline. I have suggested in the paper referred to in note 6 that such genealogical details as those furnished in the description of the boat-race are the result of an experiment which Vergil some time tried and the results of which, he found, were unsatisfactory. Certainly, if research led to the discovery of Trojan origins for only a few such families as those he mentions, he was wise to discard the technique. We may, then, at least tentatively, accept the passage already quoted from Book 8 as more truly representative of Vergil's sentiments regarding Catiline, and we may proceed to see what later writers of epic poetry say about him.

Naturally Catiline finds no place in writers like Valerius Placcus and Silius Italicus. Statius does not mention him, though Lactantius, in his commentary on Thebais 3.159, quotes from Sallust the story of the drinking of the blood, which seems to have impressed the Romans tremendously. Lucan makes three allusions to him (2.541; 6.793; 7.64), though the conspiracy took place too early to form part of Lucan's real narrative. Catiline serves him even from the lower world. Of the three references, the most interesting is 6.793. Here Catiline is shown exulting in the calamities which have overtaken the world and have avenged him. This is a vivid and effective bit of characterization. When we consider Lucan's rhetorical training and instincts, his enthusiasm for Cato, and his hatred for all who had helped to bring the Republic nearer its end, we are surprised that he has been so gentle and so subtle in his treatment of Catiline. We find in Catiline, as portrayed in Lucan, little more than the conventional criminal, too ineffective to be really dangerous, and yet useful as a stock character, hardly more real to Lucan, and yet more appropriate, than the mythological figures whom Aeneas finds in Tartarus.

Save for the one slight bit, we have, then, no clear-cut characterization of Catiline in epic poetry of the period. Much the same thing is true of the few references to him in other poets. Martial mentions him twice. In 5.69 he attacks Antony for the murder of Cicero, which not even Catiline would have dared to attempt (4). In 9.70 we have a half-comic complaint because in the happy Flavian times Caecilianus is in the habit of sighing querulously "O mores! O tempora!" In both passages Martial closes a pentameter verse with the words *Catilina nefas*. Juvenal has four allusions to him, all conventional in character⁷. The most interesting is in 10.288, the comparison of the fates of Pompey and Catiline, which strongly suggests the use of Catiline in rhetoric, of which I shall speak later.

The poetic treatment of Catiline, then, is conventional and vague. He is in the poets little more than the personification for rhetorical purposes of the crim-

inal and the conspirator. Cethegus is often associated with him. One may suspect that metrical convenience had more than anything else to do with this. One may likewise assume, and be more certain about it after examining the evidence still to be presented, that Catiline's literary immortality is largely due to rhetorical interest in him. The poets I have quoted are, of course, all rhetorical in character.

I turn now to prose. I begin with the historians. Let me say at once that I am not now concerned with the historical obligations and indebtedness of these writers, and that I make no effort to show that any particular writer used any other, except in so far as the evidence on this point is explicit. Nor am I concerned with the literary borrowings of these writers from one another. I am merely compiling a list of their statements about Catiline. Detailed accounts of the conspiracy and of Catiline are lacking, and the pictures of him are, in general, far from vivid. Thus, in the Periochae of Livy, 102, 103, we find only the barest facts about the conspiracy, its suppression by Cicero, and the death of Catiline. The story is essentially the story related by Eutropius⁸ and Florus⁹, though the latter adds some rhetorical embellishments and some details which come, apparently, directly from Sallust. Florus even shows some rather grudging sympathy for Catiline's gallant death: *Catilina longe a suis inter hostium cadavera repertus est, pulcherrima morte, si pro patria sic concidisset*. Ampelius's curious little *Liber Memorialis* hardly belongs to our period, but I cite it for completeness. In it, in 19.13 Cicero is named among the *Romani qui in toga fuerunt illustres* because he crushed the conspiracy, while in 27.5 Catiline finds his niche among those *qui adversus patriam nefaria iniere consilia*. Julius Obsequens refers casually (61) to Catiline's *nefaria conspiratio* in connection with mention of the lightning-bolt which struck the statue of the wolf. Suetonius mentions Catiline only incidentally. Thus he tells us¹⁰ that Octavius was delayed by the birth of a son and so reached the Senate after the debate on Catiline had begun. Caesar's relations with Catiline account for the only other references to him by Suetonius¹¹. Tacitus mentions him only in passing. He remarks (*Dialogus* 37.25) that Cicero's fame was due not so much to his private cases, like those of Archias and Quinctius, as to his public speeches in the cases of Catiline, Milo, and Verres. Gellius, too, has only incidental references to Catiline (I may, for convenience, include Gellius and Valerius Maximus with the historians). Thus Gellius alludes¹² to the motion that a civic crown be voted to Cicero for suppressing the *atrocissima coniuratio* which Catiline had organized.

Elsewhere¹³ Catiline is again a conventional criminal. He appears at least five times in the pages of Valerius Maximus, but only as an example. In two cases we do get glimpses of Catiline's personality as it presented itself to this writer. Catiline's love for Aurelia Orestilla is, says Valerius¹⁴, a case of *libido scelestas*, for it led him to kill his son and to show the same parricidal tendency

⁶This whole question is considered in my paper, *The Trojan Families of the Aeneid*, published in the *Virgil Papers of the University of Pittsburgh* (1930). <On this volume see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 24.40. C. K.>

⁷2.27; 8.231; 10.288; 14.41.

⁸6.15.
¹⁵6.15.

⁹2.12.

¹²2.7.20.

¹⁰Augustus 94.5.

¹¹Julius 14, 17.

¹³8.1.9.

toward the State. Catiline illustrates also, says Valerius, *dicta improba aut facta scelerata*¹⁵, and his remark about putting out the fire *ruina*, if not *aqua*, is quoted as the proof that his conscience was not yet entirely inert. Velleius Paterculus gives a brief account of the conspiracy¹⁶, and of the bravery of Catiline's death¹⁷. There are two very casual and incidental allusions without characterizing value in Pliny the Elder¹⁸. Asconius, of course, has a good deal to contribute. But Asconius was interested primarily in the historical facts, and was less concerned than we are at present with literary interpretations. We may therefore pass him by¹⁹.

Catiline is rather a favorite character with Seneca the Younger, but Seneca is for the most part interested in him as a type, not as an individual. There are, perhaps, in Seneca seven references to Catiline, though not all are important for us. He is, first, an example of ingratitude, one of a series that begins with Coriolanus²⁰. He is cited as an example of uncontrolled passion²¹. We have a familiar theme developed when we are told that Cicero would have died happily if he had perished at Catiline's hands and had thus escaped the tragedies that he experienced in later life²².

This brings me to the rhetoricians. We have already seen that the poetic use of Catiline shows traces of rhetorical influence. Hence we are not surprised to find that Seneca Rhetor mentions him five times. So, too, does Quintilian. Quintilian uses him in general to show the effectiveness of Cicero's oratory; this rather than the career of Catiline is what interests Quintilian. Thus Catiline is the occasion for the quotations of examples to show the use of direct attack²³, of an assumed situation²⁴, and of appeal to the gods²⁵. The acquittal of Catiline and Clodius may be used, says Quintilian²⁶, to show the effect of prejudice. But Catiline is also good material for practice of the *suasoria*²⁷: nec enim est quisquam tam malus ut malus videri velit. Sic Catilina apud Sallustium loquitur, ut rem sceleratissimam non malitia sed indignatione videatur audere. This tells us what we should otherwise not know, for the references to Catiline in Seneca the Elder²⁸ are too casual to be certain evidence of actual *suasoriae* dealing with Catiline. There exists, it is true, a declamation against Catiline attributed to Latro, and we have the exchange of invectives between Cicero and Sallust, all of which indicate the extent of the activity of the schools. The references to Catiline in Lucan, Martial, and Juvenal, the rhetorical and semirhetorical outbursts of Florus and Velleius, the use of Catiline as an *exemplum* by Seneca the Younger and Valerius Maximus, when they are added to the references in Seneca Rhetor and to the express testimony of Quintilian, are sufficient to show that Catiline's literary

immortality was due far more to the influence of rhetoric than to that of history. Confirmatory of this view is the use of unnecessarily violent terms of reprobation: *nefaria consilia* (Ampelius), *nefaria conspiratio* (Obsequens), *atrocissima coniuratio* (Gellius), *libido scelestas* (Valerius Maximus) are a few examples. The point of view is throughout Ciceronian²⁹. That the same was true of historical opinion is seen from the references just cited, but the influence of Cicero, and to a lesser degree of Sallust, was exerted upon all varieties of literature through the schools of rhetoric. The reputation of Catiline in the early Roman Empire (and hence his reputation to-day) may, therefore, be regarded as acquired through the schools almost entirely. Sober history dealt with him hardly at all, save in works like those of Asconius. A Catilinarian viewpoint, if such existed in antiquity, has not survived in literature, unless perhaps in the hostility to Cicero manifested occasionally by Dio Cassius. The schools made extensive use of Cicero's orations, with their numerous allusions to Catiline, and from these, tempered to a degree by the account of Sallust, men arrived at a judgment for literary purposes. Whether this was also their historical judgment we do not know. Young men formed their opinions unconsciously by what they studied in the schools. We may thus almost say that Catiline was condemned unheard in the literature of the early Empire. To what extent our judgment of him is descended directly from this it is hard to say, nor does it matter for our present purposes. The accuracy of this judgment is also not in question at present³⁰. But we may conclude from these allusions to Catiline that men's attitudes toward him were acquired almost altogether as a result of the study of Cicero in the schools of rhetoric. There is a single conspicuous exception, in what I have regarded as a rejected experiment in Aeneid 5. Otherwise the accounts of Catiline are uniform, hostile, and characteristically Ciceronian. Cicero not only crushed Catiline's hopes for the political power he sought, but he also left him with a reputation permanently besmirched. Rightly or wrongly, the early Empire followed Cicero's lead in dealing with Catiline.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

EVAN T. SAGE

REVIEWS

Yale Classical Studies, Volume One. Edited, for the Department of Classics, by Austin M. Harmon. New Haven: Yale University Press (1928). Pp. 252.

The range of subjects dealt with in the well edited and handsome volume, Yale Classical Studies, Volume One, illustrates the interests of some of the younger classical scholars in this country. The contributors and their subjects are as follows: Alfred R. Bellinger, Lucian's Dramatic Technique (3-40); Paul V. C. Baur, David and Goliath on an Early Christian Lamp

¹⁵9.11.3. For other references to Catiline in Valerius see 2.8.7; 4.8.3; 5.8.5. ¹⁶2.34.3-4. ¹⁷2.35.5. ¹⁸2.135; 33.34.

¹⁹See his commentary, *passim*.

²⁰De Beneficiis 16.1; compare 17.2. ²¹De Ira 3.18.2.

²²Ad Marcianum 20.5; De Brevitate Vitae 5.1. This was a conventional device of rhetoric, and Catiline is incidental to it. For other uses of similar devices compare Cicero, De Oratore 3.8; Tacitus, Agricola 45.1; Ambrosius, De Obitu Satyri Fratris Sui 1.30. ²³4.1.68. ²⁴5.10.99.

²⁵5.11.42. Compare, in general, 2.16.7. ²⁶5.2.4. ²⁷3.8.9.

²⁸Suasoriae 6.21, 6.26, 7.2; Controversiae 7.2.4, 7.

²⁹Dio Cassius (37.42.1) testifies to the fact that in antiquity popular opinion of Catiline was determined by what Cicero said of him. Compare Plutarch, Cicero 24.2.

³⁰I have deliberately stopped my survey before reaching Apuleius. I do not know that a study of the writers of his period and later would cause us to modify our opinion.

(41-51: one Plate); Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship* (53-102); George McLean Harper, Jr., *Village Administration in the Roman Province of Syria* (103-168); Clark Hopkins, *The Date of the Trial of Isidorus and Lampo before Claudius* (169-177); Harry M. Hubbell, *Horse Sacrifice in Antiquity* (179-192); Clarence W. Mendell, *The Epic of Asinius Pollio* (193-207); E. H. Sturtevant, *Indic Speech and Religion in Western Asia* (209-228); Prescott W. Townsend, *The Chronology of the Year 238 A. D.* (229-238); Sterling Tracy, III *Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: A Study* (239-252). It is impossible for a single reviewer to pass intelligent judgment on subjects so varied. A few remarks on each paper must, therefore, suffice.

Lucian's dialogues, Mr. Bellinger shows, are self-explanatory as to *dramatis personae*, place, and time of action. Their opening lines regularly identify the characters and define the place of action without explanations or directions by the reciter in his own person. The same is true of other stage directions: the lines make it easy for the hearer to imagine the action. Mr. Bellinger compares Lucian's technique with that of tragedy and comedy, and points out the sufficiency and subtlety of Lucian's devices. This study is important enough to deserve a separate index, and long enough to require such an index. The same thing may be said of the papers of Professor Goodenough and Mr. Harper. Separate indices might have been printed together at the end of the volume.

Professor Baur's paper deals with a unique specimen in the Stoddard Collection at Yale University. The design on the lamp under discussion illustrates one of two types representing the combat between David and Goliath; both types emanate from Alexandria.

The most important paper in the volume is that of Professor Goodenough. The philosophy of Hellenistic kingship was that the king was *νόμος ἐμψυχος*, 'Animate Law'. On page 101 we find this passage:

In brief, it has appeared that in politics the conception of the king as himself the state, its constitution, and its link with the world order seems early to have influenced the thinking of Greeks, but to have been developed to great significance only during the Hellenistic age. As represented in the figure of Animate Law it was first assimilated from the East into Greek thinking by the Pythagoreans....

Professor Goodenough's study is thorough and original. The theory of kingship here expounded influenced the Roman attitude toward the Emperor. In this connection a reference to Dio Cassius 53.17-19, and to the notes of H. T. F. Duckworth on that passage might be in place¹. Some contemporary objections to such a theory of kingship are cited in my article, *Roman Allusions in Rabbinic Literature*, *Philological Quarterly* 8 (1929), 369-387; see especially 380-384.

Mr. Harper discusses types of villages in Syria, their organization, and their administration. He makes extensive use of epigraphical evidence as well as of literary sources. When both fail, he is often forced to

reason by analogy from other provinces. His paper contains a useful Bibliography (166-168). An interesting investigation in a related subject is Mr. Harper's paper, *A Study in the Commercial Relations between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century before Christ*, in *The American Journal of Philology* 49 (1928), 1-35.

On the basis of negative evidence in the letter of Claudius published in H. I. Bell's *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (London, 1924) Mr. Hopkins proposes 41 A. D. as the date of the trial named in the title. Anton von Premerstein, *Zu den Sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrerakten*, *Philologus*, Supplementband 16, Heft 2 (1923), 1-66, had fixed the date at 53 A. D.

Professor Hubbell connects the token of the horse's head which led the Tyrian exiles to choose a site for their city (Aeneid 1.441-445) with the notion of fertility involved in the sacrifice of the October Horse. His study has more ramifications than a similar study by Professor E. S. McCartney, which appeared in *The Classical Journal* 22 (1927), 674-676.

Professor Mendell argues plausibly, but on slight evidence, that the literary work of Pollio which is mentioned in Vergil, *Eclogae* 3.87, and Horace, *Carmina* 2.1 was an epic poem. The *Pharsalia* of Lucan must, he thinks, have been inspired by the epic of Pollio, for, as Professor Mendell shows, Lucan possesses many peculiarities which must be postulated of Pollio. The Columbia University² dissertation of Elizabeth D. Pierce (Mrs. Carl Blegen), *Gaius Asinius Pollio, A Roman Man of Letters* (Privately printed, Poughkeepsie, 1922), is not cited.

Professor Sturtevant states (228) that he merely wants "to show that there are no longer any chronological or geographic difficulties in the way of assuming such influence <i. e. Indic influence upon the religions of Egypt and of Israel> as may, on other grounds, seem probable". Professor Townsend's chronology has been corrected in part by C. E. Van Sickle, *Some Further Observations on the Chronology of the Year 238 A. D.*, *Classical Philology* 24 (1929), 285-289.

III Maccabees tells how a wicked Ptolemy was miraculously thwarted in an attempt to enter the Holy of Holies, and how he therefore sought to exterminate all the Jews in his realm, being providentially forestalled in several instances by divine expedients of astounding character. The book gloats over the discomfiture of the king, points out God's constant interference on behalf of His chosen, and inculcates uncompromising intolerance. Aristeas, on the other hand, strives to show that mutual respect is feasible, and that neither the right of the king nor the scruples of the Jews need be violated. The Palestinian scholars are respectfully received in Alexandria, entertained in company with gentile philosophers, and succeed in maintaining their position with dignity and without unduly disparaging their opponents. Mr. Tracy argues that Aristeas was written as a criticism of III Maccabees and a demonstration of what the Jewish attitude should be. Ingenious as Mr. Tracy's argument is, I cannot be convinced of its truth. In the first place,

¹H. T. F. Duckworth, *A Commentary on the Fifty-third Book of Dio Cassius' Roman History*, 75 (Toronto, University of Toronto Library, 1916).

²For a review of this dissertation see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.53-54. C. K.

practically all scholars agree that Aristes is older than III Maccabees. Secondly, there are far more obvious reasons for the composition of each of the books than the desire to make them serve as preachments on Jewish behavior in Alexandria. Thirdly, there is too much in each of the books that cannot be explained by Mr. Tracy's hypothesis.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

MOSES HADAS

Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt. By William Linn Westermann. New York: Columbia University Press (1929). Pp. 69. \$3.75.

Professor Westermann's admirable book, *Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt*, is designed for specialists. The style, moreover, does not make reading easy, for the author assumes in his reader a specialist's acquaintance with the literature and the problems of the papyri.

Yet the book really has somewhat wider interest than one would at first think likely. Those latter-day Greeks who so systematically applied themselves to the exploitation of Egypt were, after all, participants in a great political movement, and the Hellenistic period which looked upon their economic experiments witnessed also the significant post-classical movements in Greek literature and art, to say nothing of the beginning of the great imperialistic policy of Rome. In the history of this period Egypt plays a prominent part. Even though the country never can quite be considered typical of the Mediterranean world, nevertheless at this time it was associated more intimately than ever with the political fortunes of its neighbors, and certain phases of its activities exercised an important influence on the larger world of Greece and Rome. There is, consequently, a good deal of importance in a scholarly treatment of the condition of slavery in Egypt under the régime of the Greek Ptolemies, for it suggests, properly, reflections on the condition of slavery generally in the Mediterranean world.

The importance of this subject and of certain new ideas brought forward by Professor Westermann must be the excuse for re-presenting rather fully the argument of his book. The starting-point is a papyrus document at Columbia University, an abstract from a royal ordinance specifying the taxes to be levied upon sales of slaves. The papyrus is a fragment (there is no clue to the total number of clauses which it contained), but the first portion is practically complete, and the author's reading of the text seems to be impeccable. This document Professor Westermann makes the basis of a number of special studies, all of them interesting and several of the highest significance. I can give here merely an outline of the contents of each.

The commentary begins (1-22) with a critical analysis of the document and the textual problems which arise from it. Professor Westermann shows clearly that the abstract was compiled for the guidance of tax-collectors, and that it deals both with sales between private individuals and with forced sales (i. e. those

conducted by the government after confiscatory action or as a result of enslavement for debt).

In pages 22-29 there is offered a skilful reconstruction of the career of Dicaearch (mentioned several times in the papyrus), one of those Greek carpet-baggers who were carried in, on the Hellenizing wave of Alexander and his successors, to batten on the fatness of the land of Egypt. Professor Westermann sketches the man's early career as a pirate and desperado employed to further the designs of Philip V of Macedon in the Aegean, and his ultimate transference (probably in 203 B. C.) to the court of Egypt, where after a short but profitable career he was executed under torture, to the complete satisfaction alike of the Greeks and the Egyptians. His appearance in this papyrus offers an interesting sidelight on the practice of the third, fourth, and fifth Ptolemies of granting to their favorites certain specified portions of the State income from taxes¹.

In pages 29-33 there is a useful summary of the information at present available concerning the form and the contents of royal ordinances. "... The *diagrammata* give the normal law in accordance with which the Ptolemaic subjects lived; they took precedence over the *nomoi*, and they were subject to frequent change" (31).

In pages 33-41 Professor Westermann applies the information available from the Columbia document to previously published royal decrees; in pages 41-48 he deals similarly with taxes and fees upon the sales of slaves.

Pages 48-54 contain an interesting case of similarity between early Roman and Greco-Egyptian legal practice, the treatment of slaves for debt. The Columbia papyrus implies that the man who had mortgaged his person and then was unable to meet his financial obligation was not automatically reduced to slavery, but was forced to assume that status by performing a definite, legal, and pseudo-voluntary act. Professor Westermann makes it seem likely that the same procedure was the rule in the similar cases of *nexi* or *obserati* in Roman law.

Perhaps the portion of the book which is of greatest general interest is that on the extent and the character of slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt (54-64). It is usually taken for granted that slaves in Egypt were abundant at all periods, but Professor Westermann in a very sane investigation here substantiates Professor Wilcken's view that slaves play little part, except as household servants, in the economic life of the country. In the Columbia papyrus, in fact, the government actually is concerned with limiting the slave traffic by the imposition of a high *ad valorem* tax on sales of slaves. As Professor Westermann points out (58-59), "... Such a policy was advisable in a country in which the density of population was relatively high and a cheap form of effective free labor was already at hand in the native Egyptian population. Particularly in the situation created by the stirrings of the Egyptian native spirit

¹Incidentally, on page 28 Professor Westermann brings to a passage long discussed by papyrologists a new interpretation which is little short of brilliant. It is one of those cases where, without changing a received text, a scholar finds entirely new significance in an old and misunderstood passage.

after the battle of Raphia in 217 B. C., any encouragement of competition of slave labor against native free labor, either in industry or in agriculture, would have been folly for the paternalistic, absolutistic dynasty of the Ptolemies....

In a book as closely reasoned as this it is possible to find minor points of disagreement. Three of these seem to me worth mentioning, although it should be noted at the outset that they do not materially affect Professor Westermann's thesis. (1) The interpretation of § 2 seems to me forced. The author's argument in simplest form runs that this clause deals with sales at public auction because § 3 does. Another explanation seems possible: it is surely more natural for the writer to have had in mind when writing § 2 the *preceding* rather than the *following* paragraph. I suggest therefore that the first two paragraphs *both* deal with private sales, § 1 applying when the buyer and the seller agreed to divide the tax between them, § 2 applying when the buyer alone paid. The higher tax rate in the latter case indicates the government's desire to discourage the assumption, by one person alone, of the full tax payment.² (2) The meaning given to § 3 also seems to me somewhat forced. Professor Westermann understands that the person who obtained possession of a slave by submitting a bid after the formal auction paid a second brokerage fee; if he obtained possession after still another bid (which was permitted according to ancient practice), he paid a third fee. It seems to me, however, that all that the Greek text says is that a second fee was levied on the final bid, regardless of whether this was the first or the second raised bid. (3) Finally, I find it difficult to accept the date assigned to the document. The author bases his argument on the phrase in § 1, 'hundredth, formerly audited as Dicaearch's concession'. The phrase "formerly audited" does not appear in §§ 4 and 5, where the words used are 'Dicaearch's concession' and simply 'concession'. Professor Westermann argues that Dicaearch therefore held two concessions (i. e. one at some time before, the other contemporaneously with, the writing of the papyrus), and that the document must have been written before the death of Dicaearch (in 197 B. C.). To my mind, however, it is unlikely that these concessions were held successively. It is simpler to assume that by the very nature of abstracts of this sort the expression 'formerly audited', used in the opening paragraph, would naturally be left out by the writer, as 'understood', in successive paragraphs. The concessions, therefore, were *all of them* formerly exercised by Dicaearch, and the document is to be dated some time after Dicaearch's death.³

²The purpose of this governmental policy is not clear. Was it designed to frustrate, by requiring two records of each sale, attempts at evasion of tax payments? The same policy, in 56 A. D., was the cause of a disagreement between the government of Nero and the slave dealers (Tacitus, *Annales* 13. 31, cited by Professor Westermann, 44). The Emperor's cabinet attempted to shift the tax to the *sellers* of slaves, but were frustrated by the dealers, who raised the price, thus placing the burden once more upon the buyers. In both cases the government policy opposed payment by the purchaser alone.

³Professor Westermann is aware of the argument given above, but rejects it—I think unwisely (1-2, and note 3). He himself cites another example (29, note 65c) where "the old name of the account of these taxes in the finance records must have been long retained as 'the *dorea* <= concession> of Agathocles'...."

But these are indeed minor objections. All scholars interested in Ptolemaic Egypt will have in this book a repository of information dealing with the economic aspects of slavery, and the social historian of the Hellenistic world will find in it an important corrective to certain commonly accepted notions about slavery in the ancient world.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE, CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

"BARBECUE"

The "barbecue sandwiches" of the roadside stands and the real barbecue—the whole beef carcass roasted slowly out of doors overnight above glowing coals—owe their flavor to the highly seasoned sauce or 'dip' with which the roasting meat is constantly basted. This is made according to traditional recipes and the secrets of its composition are often jealously guarded by expert cooks. The sauce was similarly important to the Romans, according to Martial 7.27, where he praises highly a splendid boar that has been presented to him, but the cost of the necessary sauce and the great fire also necessary give him pause. He concludes (7-10):

Sed cocus ingentem piperis consumet acervum
addet et arcano mixta Falerna garo.
Ad dominum redeas, noster te non capit ignis,
conturbator aper: vilis esurio.

Pepper, and a heap of it, Falernian wine, and *garum*, then, Martial's cook considered essential for his barbecue. Falernian wine was expensive. *Garum*, the famous fish sauce, was expensive. Pliny the Elder says (12. 28) that black pepper, the cheapest, cost four *denarii* a pound. That price does not seem excessive, and probably was not so for common use. It must have been the quantity required to barbecue this boar that staggered Martial. One ordinarily bought a little pepper in a twist of paper; sometimes the dealer used old sheets from unsuccessful books, as we know from such familiar passages as Horace, *Epistulae* 2.1. 270 and Martial 2.2.5. Persius describes (6.21) a stingy person as *ipse sacrum inrorans palinae piper*. Juvenal refers (14.293) to pepper and grain as important articles of commerce for which the trader risked his life:

occurrunt nubes et fulgura: "Solvite funem",
frumenti dominus clamat piperisve coempti,

while Pliny the Elder, who seems to have disliked pepper, expresses his amazement at the importance that this condiment acquired (12. 29): *sola placere amaritudine, et hanc in Indos peti! Quis ille primus experiri cibis voluit aut cui in appetenda aviditate esurire non fuit satis? Utrumque silvestre gentibus suis est et tamen pondere emitur ut aurum vel argentum.*

Pepper is not mentioned in Roman literature until the Augustan Age. It owed its importance then perhaps to a wider use of meat as much as to a desire for pungency and variety in seasoning. In 409 Alaric demanded as part of the ransom of Rome 3000 pounds of pepper (Zosimus 5.41). In the Middle Ages it was the exorbitant price of pepper that was one cause of the search for a sea route to India by the Portuguese.

When the route by the Cape of Good Hope was discovered in 1498, the price of pepper came down. Pepper and other spices were important in the medieval household not merely as seasonings, but, in the absence of cold storage facilities, for the preservation of meat and to hide a 'high' flavor, when that became too pronounced. This must have been true at Rome as well. To these considerations, probably, was due the popularity of the highly seasoned "barbecue" and the like.

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

PINDAR, NEMEA 3.50-52

In Pindar, Nemea 3.50-52, we find this passage:

τὸν ἐδάμπεον Ἀρτεμὶς τε καὶ θρασείῃ Ἀθῆνα,
κταίνοντ' ἐλάφους ἀνὲν κυνῶν δολίων θ' ἐρκέων·
ποσσί γὰρ κρέτεσκε.

This we may render as follows: 'At him marvelled Artemis and bold Athena, as he <=Achilles> slew stags without aid of dogs or crafty snares, for he excelled in swiftness of foot'.

It is usually said that these verses supply details concerning Achilles which are not given by Homer, who does not tell us of such hunting exploits of swift-footed Achilles. It is argued, therefore, that Pindar had access to sources of tradition, in respect to the hero, other than those Homer possessed (John A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, 223 [The University of California Press, 1921]). Actually the passage would seem to prove just the reverse. All that these verses tell us is that Pindar knew the epithet *ποδάρκης*, constantly applied by Homer to Achilles. Originally this epithet could be applied to all mighty warriors; it is the generic epithet of brave soldiers. Hence Homer naturally coupled the epithet with the name of his greatest fighter. Later, Pindar took the epithet at its face value, and thought it meant that Achilles was a champion runner. This he was not. In *Iliad* 22 we learn that Hector, nowhere particularly famed for his fleetness of foot, takes the outside track and yet is as swift as Achilles, who is running on the inside, next to the walls of Troy; indeed only the intervention of Athena (225-336) enables Achilles to bring about the Trojan champion's downfall.

The details that Pindar supplies are a natural invention due to the interpretation he placed on *ποδάρκης*. Just as all the Pindaric utterances regarding Hector need only the *Iliad* to explain them, so too the *Iliad* is sufficient source for the legend concerning Achilles as huntsman.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

E. T. SALMON

EYEBROW MAGIC

Pliny the Younger (6.2.2) says of M. Regulus, *Illud ipsum quod oculum modo dextrum, modo sinistrum circumlinebat, dextrum, si a petitore, alterum, si a possessore esset acturus, quod candidum splenium in hoc aut in illud supercilium transferebat, . . . a nimia superstitione . . . veniebat.*

I knew of no modern superstitions dealing with the eyebrow until I read an article in *The Saturday Evening*

Post of July 19, 1930, dealing with baseball superstitions, and particularly with the so-called 'breaks' of the game. In this article, under the title *The Breaks*, William E. Brandt tells of one case of eyebrow magic, saying: "... Pete Browning, who hit way over .300 for seven successive years, touching .471 in 1887, never went to bat without a nubbin of gum pasted on each eyebrow . . . Pete never said why".

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

MARTIAL 1.16

*Sunt bona, sunt quaedam mediocria, sunt mala plura
quae legis hic: aliter non fit, Avite, liber.*

O. O. McIntyre, who writes a column entitled *New York Day by Day* which appears in many newspapers, on September 9, 1930, quoted the following criticism of himself from a California civic magazine: "McIntyre sometimes strikes us as brilliant, other times as so so, and now and then as positively boring".

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

XENOPHON¹

George Gissing, in the *Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft* (Everyman's Library edition, 91-92), discusses the *Anabasis* as a work of art "unique in its combination of concise and rapid narrative with colour and picturesqueness . . ." He says further "... Many a single line of the *Anabasis* presents a picture which deeply stirs the emotions. A good instance occurs in the fourth book, where a delightful passage of unsurpassable narrative tells how the Greeks rewarded and dismissed a guide who had led them through dangerous country. The man himself was in peril of his life. Laden with valuable things which the soldiers had given him in their gratitude, he turned to make his way through the hostile region. 'When evening came he took leave of us, and went his way by night.' To my mind, words of wonderful suggestiveness . . ."

This seemed to me too, when I first read it, as it has always since that time, one of the most delightful bits in all literature, as the account of the longed-for glimpse of the sea is one of the most thrilling. It was a disappointment, then, to find no mention of the guide and his rewards in a book entitled *Xenophon, Soldier of Fortune*, by Leo V. Jacks (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1930). Mr. Jacks succeeds in his announced purpose of producing "a clear, rapid, and comprehensive story of Xenophon's life and adventures that would be of interest to the general reader . . ." It is well that those who have no Greek can have this account of a great adventure, but only those who, like Gissing, read Xenophon's own words, can know what is lost even in such an account as Mr. Jacks's.

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

NOISE

Horace, Juvenal, Martial, Pliny, and Statius complain of the noise of Rome, long before street railways, Church bells, and motor-cars with their squawking horns made the city as noisy as it is now. Even so, to wake early and hear the market wagons coming into Rome, or to wake at a still earlier hour and hear Romans going home is to understand something of the noise that disturbed residents of Rome in old days.

Horace, in *Carmina* 3.29.12, refers to the *strepitus Romae*. His longing for the country (*Sermones* 2.6.60-

¹For a fuller presentation of the passage in Gissing see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.215, column 2. C. K. >.

76), O rus, quando ego te adspiciam! . . . includes sleep among the joys possible there. The implication is that sleep was lacking in the city. In *Epistulae* 1.17.6-8 Horace suggests that Scaeva go to Ferentinum for sleep and quiet:

Si te grata quies et primam somnus in horam
delectat, si te pulvis strepitusque rotarum,
si laedit caupona, Ferentinum ire iubebo.

In *Epistulae* 2.2.72-76, complaining of the difficulty of writing in the city, he describes the confusion of the city streets. In 79-80 he says:

tu me inter strepitus nocturnos atque diurnos
vis canere et contracta sequi vestigia vatum?

Juvenal says bitterly (3.232), *Plurimus hic < = Romae > aeger moritur vigilando*. . . . Compare 234-238:

. . . nam quae meritoria somnum
admittunt? Magnis opibus dormitur in urbe.
Inde caput morbi. Raedarum transitus arto
vicorum inflexu et stantis convicia mandrae
eripient somnum Druso vitulisque marinis.

Martial (1.49.35-36) says to Licinianus, who is returning to Spain,

Non rumpet altum pallidus somnum reus,
sed mane totum dormies.

When he is himself again in Spain, he writes back to Juvenal (12.18.13-16):

Ingenti fruor improboque somno,
quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora,
et totum mihi nunc repono, quidquid
ter denos vigilaveram per annos.

In 10.64.12 he expresses his longing for sleep. In 12.57 he complains again of the city noises: compare 2-3:

Nec cogitandi, Sparse, nec quiescendi
in urbe locus est pauperi.

He then bitterly enumerates sources of noise, beginning with the schoolmasters, to whom also he paid his compliments in 9.68, begging to be allowed to sleep in the early morning. His appeal to the teachers in 10.62 to dismiss their students was probably based more on his own desire to sleep than on deep anxiety for the health of the boys, for all he concludes that *aestate pueri si valent, satis discunt!*

Pliny the Younger says (9.6.1) that he can work in the city *incredibilissima quiete* when everyone else is off at the games in the Circus. Statius (*Silvae* 3.5.85-88) praises the peace and the quiet of Naples, where one can finish his sleep (86), *et numquam turbata quies, somnique peracti*!

The best commentary on these passages, now that noise and its evil effects are being seriously studied, may be found in the frequent appearance this year in the daily papers and in the popular magazines of news items and articles dealing with the subject of noise. The New York Times of May 10, 1930, reporting the third general meeting of the Acoustical Society of America, announced that "noises in an office reduce the efficiency of employees by as much as 10 per cent." The Illinois State Register, Springfield, Illinois,

<Some remarks on references in Horace to noise in Rome will be found in my paper, Roman Business Life as Seen in Horace, The Classical Journal 2.111-122; see page 116. C. K.>

on Sunday, October 12, 1930, quoted Dr. H. H. Tuttle, City Superintendent of Health, as stating that "The elimination of disturbing and unnecessary noises is a matter of important concern among the various cities of the country. . . ." In the Saturday Evening Post of November 8, 1930, Floyd W. Parsons opens an article entitled Devils of Din with the statement that it is estimated that the annual cost of unnecessary noise is greater than the yearly losses to the nation from fire.

MACMURRAY COLLEGE,
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

VIII

Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature—August, Review, favorable, by Albert Rivaud, of Perceval Frütiger, *Les Mythes de Platon*; Review, favorable, by A. Ernout, of J. Martha, *Cicéron: Des Termes Extrêmes des Biens et des Maux*, Tome II; Review, favorable, by A. Ernout, of P. Oltramare, *Sénèque: Questions Naturelles*; Review, generally favorable, by L.-A. Constans, of E. Ciaceri, *Cicerone e i suoi Tempi*, Volume 2; Review, favorable, by Albert Rivaud, of William Kroll, *Die Kosmologie des Plinius, mit Zwei Excursen von H. Vogt*; September, Long review, favorable, by Albert Rivaud, of A. Rey, *La Science Orientale avant les Grecs*; Review, unfavorable, by Ch. Picard, of W. Peek, *Der Isishymnus von Andros und Verwandte Texte*; Review, generally favorable, by L. Halphen, of A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*.

Saturday Review of Literature—December 27, Physics and Platonism, F. S. C. Northrop [this article grows out of a generally favorable appraisal of Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*. "What Sir James is saying today, and what Plato said some twenty odd centuries ago, is simply this: the world that you look at is not the real world, it is but a shadowy appearance of some more complete and purely logical and mathematical system which can be known only by reason. In brief, nature at bottom is a system of mathematical equations, rather than a collection of moving atoms"].

School and Society—December 13, Virgil Bimillennium Celebrated Prematurely, W. C. Eells.

Scientia—Volume 48, (1930), No. 10, La Questione dell'Origine degli Indo-Europei e le Recenti Scoperte della Linguistica, A. M. Pizzagalli; No. 12, Le Sens Religieux des Jeux Antiques, A. Piganiol; Review, generally favorable, by A. M. Pizzagalli, of A. Trombetti, *La Lingua Etrusca*.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

ADOLPH F. PAULI
JOHN W. SPARTH, JR.